P.R. 62 of 93.

G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references.

1892-93.
~~192~~ .
(L.R.)

File No. 138 of 92

Serial Nos 1 to 5

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

Serial Nos. 1 to 5

M ~~Part~~ B for December 1893.

SUBJECT.

Appeal of Venkatanarasappa of Marohally, Kaukanhalli Taluk Regarding the Shanbhogi of Marohalli and other Villages.

Venkatanarasappa of Marohalli Kaukanhalli Taluk

W.D. 2285—G.P.I.—20,000—11-6-20

Received

5/12

(5)

M No 225 of 1891-92

Appt
Venkatanarayanappa
of Narasandra
Kankanhalli
Taluq
Bangalore Dt

Respt
Thimmaiya
Rangachary

Appt & respt maternal grandfather
who are encroaching upon each other
Chennarayappa were joint Shanbhogs of
4 Villages named in the Margin each had
1 Hadhalli
2 Narasandra
3 Moralagere
4 Devenkallahalli
½ share. Chennarayappa was
doing the duties in village No 1, & 2
Respt in villages Nos 3 & 4. On
the death of Chennarayappa, ~~& Dy~~
& on payment ~~of sum~~ by the father
of the Respt of the sum stated to have been
embezzled by him the Dy Com^r appointed
Respt in Sept 1891. The appellant against
the appointment

Appt has not a shadow of right
in the office. His advocate admits it & says
that he stands at least be appointed a
Surnavis for respt the is a minor as he

as a Co-sharer The appointment of
a Summons is ordered at the discretion
of the Dist Court & appl has no right to
claim it. The appeal is dismissed.

MS
25/11/93

Rec'd
Applt is informed that his
appeal has been dismissed
& he has no right whatever
to the office claimed

6

on the Sanabagee failed to pay
the amount within the time, and as
he also left the village, the Amildar
recommended the appointment of
Shamanna as Jamabandi till the
disposal of the case against Shamanna
Son Venkatramappa petitioned
the Amildar and the Deputy Commissioner
requesting that as Shamanna
and himself were jointly looking
after the work of the Sanabagee of
Harohalli till 1881 when Shama-
nappa forcibly took away the
records from him and began to
do the duty himself, he may be
appointed as Sanabagee instead
of Shamanna.

On the 3rd February 1887 Venkatramappa
presented a petition to the Jamabandi
officer urging his claims to the
Sanabagee of Harohalli On this
petition the Jamabandi officer
ordered that Venkatramappa
may be appointed as Sanabagee
instead of Shamanna as the
latter was under suspension

6-2-87

and

said as he neither paid the amount
due by him nor did he join his unit.
On the 2nd July 1887 Chinnaraya[illegible]
represented in his petition to the Deputy
Commissioner that on account of
some family misfortune and his own
illness, he was obliged to leave the
village and that as he owed no
money whatever to Government,
the order of the Sub-Division officer
(Jamabandi officer) may be set
aside and his appointment restored
to him. The Deputy Commissioner
then sent for the records of the case
and asked the opinion of the Sub
Division officer, who in reply
requested that his order on the
petition of Venkatarama[illegible]
may be approved. The Deputy
Commissioner then referred the
matter to the Sub Division officer
for further enquiry and report,
as to how Chinnaraya was
at fault.
On the 2nd March 89 Venkatarama[illegible]
again

10 This appeal against the order of the Deputy Commissioner on the following grounds ——

1. That as the deceased Sanabagi Chinnayappa was guilty of misappropriating Government money, his relatives are not entitled to the Sanabagi

2. That though he is the Sanabagi of three villages, the remuneration he derives is much less than the remuneration of the Sanabagi of Hirekohalli alone.

DK.

Box

12

Petn branch
Mar 1/1892



1

To



The Hon'ble Rao Bahadur
The Dewan of Mysore

A.S.No53. Bangalore
1892-93.

The humble petition of Venkaia Hasanajia residing at Harohally Kankanhally Talug Bangalore District most respectfully. —

Sheweth.

That the villages of Harohally, Maralajini, Marasandra, and Dyavarakagalhally were originally registered in the joint names of Venkatasoobiah and Venkataheciah as joint Shaibogues

2 That after the death of the original Shaibogues Venkatasoobiah and Venkataheciah aforesaid the registry was changed to Venkata Boyappa and Venkata Soobiah.

3

legacy to neglect the duties of
Shanbogue of the villages Thara
Harohally; and he was also collecting
and appropriating the dues of the
Shanbogie of the village of Harohally
to himself.

7 That, therefore the petitioner
not only complained to the authorities
but also applied that in as much
as Cheeranjeeva Rao disqualified
himself by embezzling the Govt
money he (Peti.) alone may appointed
sole Shanbogue of all the villages
above named by reason of his being
the joint Shanbogue.

8 That no final order was passed
upon his repeated petitions until
after the death of Cheeranjeeva
and then his daughters son a
Sreerangachar minor aged 4 years
was put in as successor of the
deceased Cheeranjeeva by the Rama-
-bandi officer who also passed orders
to the

though deceased was guilty
of contempt of the office
of Chancellor is confirmed upon
the relation of this Plaintiff is
not entitled to the same by reason
of the Joint proceedings upon the
subject.

That besides this is a piece of
great injustice to the petitioner
in as much as the remuneration
of the office has not been equally
and equally distributed between
the two Offices heads namely the petitioner
and the other. The Barony of the
three villages above named all put
together is only Rs 300 yielding such
income to the officiator only Rs 150
more as the Barony of Chanhalli alone
is Rs 3500 yielding and income of
Rs 300 a year. Thus unequal division
of remuneration is patent. —

That the petitioner is the
lineal descendent of the original
Chanhogue and the Co-Chanhogue
of the

to appoint him as
Secretary to the Minor
Seminaries and
to direct a moiety
of the remuneration
of the office should
be regularly paid
to him.

Read for the Petitioners pray

Columbus

Mr Ryan

(Petition dated 1892) Petition

Pet
600

ground

(3)

19

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Petition No. 1128
dated 12th November 92 received at the
Dewan's Office from [illegible]
[illegible] against the [illegible]
[illegible] in the [illegible]
[illegible] villages,

23-12-92

is forwarded, together with its [illegible]
enclosures, to the [illegible], Bangalore,
[illegible] for [illegible] a Report on the [illegible]
[illegible] on the points raised in the
Petition.

The Petn should be returned.

L.R. 138-92-2

No 5429 Transmitting Petition

By Order,

Draft

10/11

Chief Secretary.

12 Nov 1892.

BANGALORE,

Engrossed
12/11/92

Received in the Fy Sec/12

(General Serial No. 30.)

6732

1892-93

Ver Papers

From The Dy Commissioner
Bangalore District

To

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan
of Mysore.

(158-92-3)
L.A. 158-92-3.

Dated 23rd December 1892.

Despatched

Received

Enclosures No. 2 files & 3
Ver. Papers.

General No.
D No. 542.

In reply to Ch. Secy's Off. Prom No 6000
dt 12-11-92.

SUBJECT.

Reports on petition from
Venkatramappa of Hero-
-hally Kankanhally Taluk
appealing against the Com.rs'
order in re his Shanbogue
-ship of Varthalli and
3 other villages, with Proceedings.

Petition 23/12

References (to be entered only in the Dewan's Office).

Part II
first matter
Not to be
destroyed

21

16/5

Ordered 5th August 93.

Adjourned to 5th October 93

Adjourned to 23 4 94

24/12/92

Could not account for the D.C.
Commissioner gave him time
to make good the amount
which he failed to do, inspite
of repeated notices. The Sub-
Division officer appointed one
Shamanna as Gumasta pend-
ing disposal of the case and
ordered Chennaiya's property
to be proceeded against for
the recovery of the amount due.
Certain property was attached
but others claiming it, the
attachment was raised. The
petitioner then objected to the nomi-
nation of Shamanna, as a
Gumasta, and prayed that
he might be appointed to the
office. The Sub-Division officer
enquiring whether the petitioner
would pay the amount due
by Chennaiya paid and a

appoint-

appoint a Gumasta for the Petitioners 3 villages if the Sheristhedar office of Harihalli was given to him, he declined to do so, (vide his statement dated August 1886). In the meantime, Lokenaragappa died on 16th October 1893, leaving a daughter and a daughter in-law who consented to pay the amount due, and the Sub Divisional officer appointed, at their request, Sree Srinivasa Chari, the adopted son of the deceased, to continue the former Gumasta to continue during Srinivasa Chari's minority.

3 - The Petitioner's Instructions transpired then appealed to me against the Sub Divisional officer's order and I found no reason to interfere.

I beg to enclose the records.

I have the honour to be
Sir
your most obedient servant
B Coothpadawiyar

Sub Assistant Commissioner

No. 1128 / A.1.53

6-12-93

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT,

3-12-Dec 1893 (6)

6-12

Endorsement granted to Venkatanarayanappa of ~~Hara~~ Harohalli, Ramkanhalli Taluk, Bangalore District

in reply to his Petition Registered No. 1128 / A.1.53 dated November 92 appealing against the order of the Deputy Commr of Bangalore rejecting the appln of Shanbhog of Harohalli

Petitioner is informed that his appeal has been dismissed as he has no right whatever to the office claimed.

2. The enc: is returned

R.R. 138-92-5

"By Order"

Redraft

4/12

Chief Secretary.

S.V.

Mysore Govt. Central Press, Bangalore.—9-2-93—2000.

No. 20. 53 of 1892-93

Pleas

Appellant

Venkatnaranappa of Harohalli

Chennaroyappa and Venkatroyappa were the joint Sanabogues of Harohalli, Narasandra, Maralegire, and Dyavarakagalhalli in the Kankanhalli Taluk. According to the Deputy Commissioner's order No. 266 dated 18th January 1868, Venkatnaranappa's name was registered as Sanabogue instead of his father's.

Vide Amildar's report 167/83 of 10.9.91

In 1885 one Sheshappa of Harohalli complained to the Deputy Commissioner that Sanabogue Chennaroyappa and Shekdar of Harohalli failed to put him in possession of the land he obtained by darakast according to the order of the Amildar and that they fraudulently raised crops on the land and appropriated the produce for their own use. This complaint

was referred to the Amildar for
enquiry and report.

The Amildar submitted his report 22. 7. 85.
with the deposition of the Shekdar
and others and stated that as
Sanaboque Chennaroyappa was
not in the village and as he did
not appear before him, he was
not able to enclose the Sanaboques
deposition

The Deputy Commissioner suspended 3. 8. 85.
the Sanaboque for absenting himself
without permission. The Sanaboque
continued in suspension as there
were other charges against him.

On 2nd Nov. 85 Chennaroyappa
applied for one year's leave on
substitute of one Shamanna.
But the Amildar did not grant
him the leave as the accounts had
to be compared by him.

During the Jamabandi of 1885-86,
it was discovered that the Sanaboque
had misappropriated Government
money, and the Jamabandi officer
ordered him to make good the
amount within 8 days: but

8

again petitioned the Amildar in the request that he may be order to do the duty of the Sanabogue of Harohalli. The Amildar then repor

7.3.89. to the Sub-Division officer that Venkat narayanappa may be appointed as Sanabogue as requested by him, but the Sub-Division officer ordered that the existing arrangements may be

13.3.89 continued till the disposal of the case against Chennarayappa. The case continued pending as Chennarayappa never appeared before the Amildar.

Chennarayappa died on the 15th Octo 90, On the 31st December 1890, the Amilda according to the order of the Jamabandi officer issued a notice to Sabamma daughter-in-law and Venkatlaksh-mamma, daughter of Chennarayappa stating that as the deceased Chennarayappa owed Rs 291-12-2 to Government, they must pay the amount within 15 days from the date of notice, if they wanted to preserve their kuck to the Sanabogue of Harohalli

On

On the 21st April 1891 Ramanuja Char, son-in-law of Chinnaroyappa paid the money to the Amildar and asked him to register the name of Sreenivasaranga Char, his 2nd son and adoptive of the deceased Chinnaroyappa as Sanabogue of Harohalli, and that Shamanna the present Gumasta may continue to look after the work of the Sanabogue during the minority of Sreenivasaranga Char.

On the report of the Amildar, the 10.9.91 Sub-Division officer ordered that the minor Sreenivasarangachar's name may be registered as Sanabogue, as the amount due by the deceased Sanabogue was 14.9.91 paid by him —

On this order, Venkatnaranappa appealed to the Deputy Commissioner who confirmed the order of the Sub. 8-9-92. Division officer, as he found no reason to interfere.

Venkatnaranappa now prefers

(General Serial No. 32.)

189 2.

Stamp. Suffict
1) Must prod.
2) Appeal in time
3) Rule I Cl 1 of the Add Rules

Call for Proc: with report BO
K
5/11/92

L: R. 138-92-1

No. 112 8

Name of Petitioner. Kenchaiya

Village. Nanchalli

Taluk. Kankanhalli

District. Bangalore

Date of Arzi. 0 — 10: 92

Date of Receipt. 1 — 11 — 92

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. Two

ABSTRACT.

Appeal against the D Commr's order No. 21 & 28-9-92 declining the D commr Registering of the Sharakhat in favour of the Appellant's youn Register's decument

SRR
2/11/92

Mysore Govt. Central Press Bangalore—7-9-92,—4000.

3 That after the death of the last named persons the rejoinder was made out in the joint names of the petitioner the grandson by Son of the original Venkata Soobiah and Cheeroyappa a brother's Son of the original (?) Venkatachelliah. — — —

4 That the said Cheeroyappa died about the year 1889 without any male issue. — — — — —

5 That during the life time of the aforesaid Cheeroyappa he was accused of embezzling Govt money and was reported by the then Sub Division officer Mr. Abdul Rahiman Sahib to be removed from the office of Shanbogue. While the proceedings were still pending, the aforesaid Cheeroyappa died. — — — —

6 That during the life time of the said Cheeroyappa in or about 1881-1882 a dispute between the petitioner and the Cheeroyappa, the latter began to

to the effect that if the minor were to deposit the amount/about Rs 50 embezzled by deceased Cheeroy appa the minor would be confirmed in the office.

That upon the minor's father 7 succeeding the said amount the Sub Division officer passed an order to the effect, that the minor should be recognized as registered Shanbogue and that one Shamiah (a Stranger and different caste man should act as Gomasta of the minor) attend to the duties of the Shanbogue of the village of Harohally notwithstanding the opposition of the petitioner

That upon this, the petitioner 10 appealed to the Deputy Commissioner of the Bangalore District, but he Summarily dismissed his appeal refusing to interfere with the order of the Sub division officer ——

That it is evident from the order 11 of the Sub Division officer that

thereby

of the Villages dying without
issue and 17 committing an
offence subjecting him and
his descendants from the
removal of the office the
petitioner alone should have
been appointed Shanbogue
of all the villages.

Under the above
circumstances
the petitioner
prays that Your
Honor may be
pleased to appoint
him as sole
Shanbogue of
the four villages
named above
or if it could
not be done
to appoint

Dy Commissioners office
Bangalore District

D. No-542.

Dated 23rd December 1892

(4)

Encl: 2 files
& 3 Ver: Papers

To

The Chief Secretary to the
Dewan of Mysore

Sir

In returning the enclosure received with your official Memo No: 600 dated 12th Ultimo, forwarding Shanbhog Venkatnaranappah's petition for report, I have the honor to state, that one Chennaroyappa and the Petitioner were the registered Shanbhogs of Harohalli, Marlagere, Narasimhadra and Samrakagla halli villages in the Kankanhally Taluk. The former was a Sri Vyshnava Brahmin and the latter is a Madhava Brahmin. They had each a half share, but according to their mutual agreement Chen-naroyappah held the office

Before the Government of *His Highness* the Maharaja of Mysore.

(7)

Appeal No. ~~225~~ 53 of 1891-92

Appellant. Vs. Respondent.

Venkatānarāmappa of Narasandra, Kankanhalli Taluk, Bangalore District

Srinivasa-rangachary

R. R. 138-92-4 Decision. of 25th November 93

Appellant and Respondent maternal grandfather Chennaroyappa, who were unconnected with each other were joint shanbhogs of 4+ villages named in the margin. Each had ½ share.

*1 Harohalli
2. Marasandra
3. Moralagere
4. Devarkalhalli

Chennaroyappa was doing the duties in villages Nos 1, and the Respondent in villages Nos *2 to 4. On the death of Chennaroyappa and on payment

Clear if it is these words to be in italics.

by the father of the Respondent of the sum said to have been embezzled by him, the Deputy Commissioner appointed Respondent in September 1891. The appeal is against this appointment.

2. Appellant has not a shadow of right to the Office. His advocate admits it and says that he should at least be appointed a guardian for Respondent who is a minor, as he is a co-sharer. The appointment of a guardian is entirely at the discretion of the Deputy Commissioner and appellant has no right to claim it. The appeal is dismissed

By order
Receipt [illegible] 4/12
for Chief Secretary

2/12/93

Copy to the Deputy Commr. Bangalore District with the records received with his Rec 6428 of 23.12.92

No. 8885 / Rev. F. 62-93

By order
[illegible]
for Chief Secretary.

Press copy sent